

Remarks

The Office Action dated August 5, 2008 has been carefully considered. Claims 5, 6, 9, 14, 17, and 29 have been amended and claims 33-36 have been newly added without addition of new matter. Claims 18-19 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the current claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

In Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 3-6, 8-10, 14, 15, 17-19, 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 10 and 29 have been amended so that the SAP particles with the salt coating have been washed off and have a water absorption property of absorbing from about 5.7 grams to about 12 grams of water per gram of superabsorbent polymer in about 15 seconds according to the Free Water Absorption 15 second (FWA_{15sec}) Test. Support for this comes from Table 1 and Table 2 wherein it is shown that the base superabsorbent polymer has a FWA_{15sec} of up to 7.2 grams of water per gram of superabsorbent polymer, which would reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This amendment makes the rejection moot. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 5 and 14 have been amended to change the absorption property from 2 to 3g or less, which is supported by the description. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 6 and 15 have been amended to change the absorption property from 1 to 1.5g or less, which is supported by the examples in the description. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In Paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 9 has been amended to delete the AUL property, hence making the rejection moot. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In Paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 17 has been amended to delete the AUL property, hence making the rejection moot. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 18 has been canceled thus making this rejection moot.

In Paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 19 has been canceled thus making this rejection moot.

In Paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 29 has been amended so that there is from about 0.01% to about 5% by weight of surface crosslinking agent, thereby mooting this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' counsel at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip P. McCann/

Philip P. McCann
Registration No. 30,919

SMITH MOORE LEATHERWOOD LLP
P.O. Box 21927
Greensboro, NC 27420
(336) 378-5302
phil.mccann@smithmoorelaw.com

Date: November 3, 2008

File No.: 5003073.034US1